



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,671	02/20/2004	Walter K. Proniewicz	64154-5006	7285

24574 7590 05/22/2006

JEFFER, MANGELS, BUTLER & MARMARO, LLP
1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS, 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER

WINAKUR, ERIC FRANK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3768

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 6, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With regard to claim 6, it is unclear what Applicant intends by the phrase "equalizing the iris"; further, the phrase "the brightness around the pupil" lacks antecedent basis. With regard to claim 14, the phrase "the lookup table" lacks antecedent basis. With regard to claim 17, it is unclear what further method step Applicant intends to set forth.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 2 - 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 2 appears to be directed to processing data to determine physiological information rather than a practical application of the physiological information. Claim 2 does not result in a physical transformation nor does it appear to provide a useful, concrete and tangible result. Specifically, it does not appear to produce a tangible result because merely correlating an integrated value to a glucose level is nothing more than a computation within a processor. It fails to use or

Art Unit: 3768

make available for use the result of the correlation to enable its functionality and usefulness to be realized. Additionally, the asserted practical application in the specification is for displaying the results. The practical application is not explicitly recited in the claims nor does it flow inherently therefrom. Therefore, claim 2 appears non-statutory.

In addition, dependent claims 3 - 21, while reciting further limitations, fail to explicitly or inherently recite the practical application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 2 - 4, 10 - 13, 15 - 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lambert et al. Lambert et al., Figures 5, 6, 7b, teach a non-invasive glucose monitoring method that includes illuminating aqueous humor of a subject with light, receiving light waves as pixels with a CCD, integrating the pixels to form an integrated spectrum (column 9, lines 22 - 31), and analyzing the spectra to determine glucose level (column 9, lines 33 - 60; column 10, lines 50 - 67). A fixation light is used to assure/identify proper alignment with the center of the eye. The image is captured as pixels with a cooled CCD (column 9, lines 15 - 18); cooling the CCD

Art Unit: 3768

necessarily removes hot spots. Filters 20, 21 are used for collecting the light waves; further, the light source can include wavelength filters (column 7, line 63 - column 8, line 4). Any optical arrangement between a source and an illuminated object is necessarily positioned having "an angle" there between. Data can be transmitted to remote locations through a suitable communication line (column 7, lines 3 - 6). Lambert et al. is considered to meet the limitation of claim 17, as best understood.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. as applied to claims 2 and 11 above. Lambert et al. teach all of the features of the claimed invention except that the data is on a lookup table and that an image of an eye as viewed by the image sensor is displayed on the monitor. However, use of a data table for storing glucose levels is merely an alternate equivalent expedient of the calculation-based analysis described by Lambert et al. As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement Lambert et al. with a lookup table for determining the glucose level instead of using a calculation-based implementation, since it has generally been held to be within the skill level of the art to substitute alternate equivalent expedients. Further, it is well known to use a CCD to produce images on a monitor. It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3768

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lambert et al. to include displaying images from the CCD, since it has generally been held to be within the skill level of the art to use elements for their known purposes.

Double Patenting

9. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

10. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,853,854. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are broader than those of the patent. Thus, any method meeting the limitations of the patent would necessarily meet those of the instant application, as well.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric F. Winakur whose telephone number is 571/272-4736. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5; alternate Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eleni Mantis-Mercader can be reached on 571/272-4740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3768

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Eric F Winakur
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3768